

## **BOROUGH OF REIGATE AND BANSTEAD**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held as a Webex Remote meeting on 20 May 2020 at 7.30 pm.

Present: Councillors D. Allcard (Chairman), M. S. Blacker (Vice-Chair), J. S. Bray, H. Brown, J. P. King, S. A. Kulka, S. McKenna, R. Michalowski, C. Stevens, R. S. Turner, S. T. Walsh, R. Absalom, C. T. H. Whinney (Substitute) and S. J. G. Rickman (Substitute).

Also present: Councillor R. Ashford.

#### **130. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 29 April 2020 be approved and signed as a correct record.

#### **131. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Harp (substituted by Councillor Whinney) and Councillor Kelly (substituted by Councillor Rickman).

#### **132. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

#### **133. ADDENDUM TO THE AGENDA**

**RESOLVED** that the addendum be noted.

#### **134. 19/01176/F KINGSWOOD FIELDS, MILLFIELD LANE, LOWER KINGSWOOD, SURREY, KT20 6RP**

The Committee considered an application at Kingswood Fields, Millfield Lane, Lower Kingswood, for the extension of a multi-decked car park to provide 326 car parking spaces, with associated landscaping and plant enclosure.

Jeffrey Harris, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the Travel Plan had not demonstrated the objectives set out in national guidance, insofar as it made unrealistic assumptions on the future capacity of the site, and had not realistically reflected the likely peak time travel demands on Smithy Lane nor mentioned the potential impact on Chipstead Lane.

Robert Gardner, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the Travel Plan had not taken into account the likely growth in staff numbers, and that the cost and time implications of the public transport alternatives contained within the plan served to demonstrate that staff would still choose to drive to the site. The Travel Plan would lead to greater congestion and more pollution overall.

Peter Horrell, the Chief Executive of Fidelity International (the applicant), spoke in support of the application on the grounds that the company had chosen to invest in the Kingswood site, whilst closing its site in Tonbridge. The site would benefit from

significant landscaping, including the planting of trees, and the car parking provision would ensure that residents would not be affected by parking displacement as a consequence of the increase in the number of staff using the site. The new pavilion would provide health and wellbeing opportunities for staff, and the plans reflected the feedback received from the consultation, particularly around rescheduling delivery times to the site.

Councillor Ashford, a Ward Member for Lower Kingswood, Tadworth and Walton, explained to the Committee that residents were concerned about the road safety implications of the application and that the consultation undertaken by the applicant had not considered those concerns.

A motion to defer the application was proposed by Councillor Bray, and seconded by Councillor Walsh, whereupon the Committee voted and **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **DEFERRED** for instruction of independent transport advice to review the highways information and Travel Plan supporting the application.

**135. 19/01184/F KINGSWOOD FIELDS, MILLFIELD LANE, LOWER KINGSWOOD, SURREY, KT20 6RP**

The Committee considered an application at Kingswood Fields, Millfield Lane Lower Kingswood, for the demolition of an existing pavilion, grounds maintenance buildings and hard standing areas; and the construction of a new replacement pavilion, and a replacement grounds maintenance building (ancillary to the main campus), including associated car and cycle parking, external plant enclosure and landscaping works.

Linda Heaton, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the development was on green belt land, would disturb wildlife, and increase noise pollution due to the movement of heavy goods vehicles. The proposed sports facility would not benefit residents and there would be a negative overall environmental impact. The objector urged the Committee to consider traffic calming measures to offset the negative impact on the local community.

Joanne Leek, an agent for the applicant, spoke in support to the application on the grounds that the uniqueness of the site had been reflected in the application, with landscaping and safeguarding of the natural habitat provided by the planting of 108 new trees. The wellbeing of staff would be enhanced by the new pavilion, with greater cycling provision. The pavilion was of a high sustainable design standard, on a key employment site for the Borough.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **GRANTED** as per the recommendation and addendum, **subject to** the strengthening of the Construction Management Plan (condition 11).

**136. 19/01177/F KINGSWOOD FIELDS, MILLFIELD LANE, LOWER KINGSWOOD, SURREY, KT20 6RP**

The Committee considered an application at Kingswood Fields, Millfield Lane, Lower Kingswood, for the provision of new landscaping in-between the existing three office buildings.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **GRANTED** as per the recommendation and addendum, **subject to** the strengthening of the Construction Management Plan (condition 3).

**137. 19/01488/F LAND BOUNDED BY CHEQUERS LANE AND HURST DRIVE, WALTON ON THE HILL, SURREY**

The Committee considered an application at the land bounded by Chequers Lane and Hurst Drive, Walton on the Hill, for the creation of vehicular access from Chequers Lane, erection of a two-storey mansion block of 10 apartments and erection of four houses and associated landscaping and car parking.

The Committee were satisfied that the application had been discussed at North Forum and that the tree removal proposals had been clarified.

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **GRANTED** as per the recommendation.

**138. 19/2020/F REAR OF 36-38 REIGATE ROAD, REIGATE, SURREY**

The Committee considered an application at the rear of 36-38, Reigate Road, Reigate, for the construction of one pair of semi-detached houses with associated car parking and landscaping.

Mel Weber, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the proposal was not compliant with local planning policy, specifically, CS10, DES1 and DES2. The objector felt that the proposed development would be prominent and incongruous, that would fail to maintain the character of the locality.

James Westcott, from the Deering's Road Residents' Association, spoke in objection to the application on the grounds that the size of the site was materially smaller than stated, that there was no housing need justification, and that a similar 3 bedroom dwelling on the site had been previously refused by the Committee.

Billy Clements, representing the applicant, spoke in support of the application on the grounds that the Council's own planning policies acknowledged the contribution of garden land development to local housing supply. The decision of the previous appeal was that the scale and massing of that application was not in character, *not* the presence of a building. The footprint of the application now being considered was one-third of that of the previous application, and the scale and height of the development had been substantially reduced.

Reasons for refusal were proposed by Councillor Absalom and seconded by Councillor Blacker, whereupon the Committee voted and **RESOLVED** that planning permission be **REFUSED** on the grounds that:

1. The proposal by virtue of the form of the development in an otherwise undeveloped, open back garden location would result in development which appears prominent and incongruous within this context and fails to maintain the character of the locality. This is contrary to policy CS10 of the Reigate and Banstead Core Strategy and Policies DES1 and DES2 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019, the Reigate and Banstead Local Distinctiveness Design Guide 2004 and the provisions of the NPPF.

2. The proposed development would by reason of the proximity and juxtaposition of upper floor windows, result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the gardens of properties in Deerings Road adjacent to the site contrary to the provisions of DES1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Scheme (2019) and the NPPF.
3. The proposal would result in the displacement of existing car parking within the site leading to harm to the residents whose parking arrangements are lost and potential amenity issues associated with the displacement parking occurring in the wider area, contrary to Policy TAP1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019.

**139. 20/00503/F 94 BRIGHTON ROAD, HORLEY, SURREY, RH6 7JQ**

**RESOLVED** that the application be **DEFERRED** to the next Ordinary meeting of the Committee, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.10.

**140. 19/02386/F ROMANS GARAGE, BRIGHTON ROAD, BANSTEAD, SURREY, SM7 1AT**

**RESOLVED** that the application be **DEFERRED** to the next Ordinary meeting of the Committee, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.10.

**141. 20/00728/F THE RING PAVILION, HORLEY ROAD, REDHILL**

**RESOLVED** that the application be **DEFERRED** to the next Ordinary meeting of the Committee, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.10.

**142. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There was none.

The Meeting closed at 11.00 pm

**Clerk's note:**

- a) In accordance with Committee Procedure rule 4.10.2, the business of the meeting had not been concluded by 10:30pm. The Committee resolved that the meeting be continued in order to conclude items 8 and 9 and that Items 10, 11 and 12 be deferred to the next Ordinary meeting of the Committee.
- b) Councillors Stevens and Whinney left the meeting at 10.50pm.
- c) These minutes reflect the order of business on the published agenda.